

REMARKS

This is responsive to the final Office Action mailed on December 9, 2003. In that Office Action, the Examiner once again rejected all of the claims. It is believed that this Amendment places the claims in allowable form. Entry of this response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner once again rejected claims 49, 52-54, 57 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen in view of Keating. The Examiner recognizes that Andersen fails to disclose a truss externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel. The Examiner then states that Keating discloses an external truss externally mounted on an outside face of a bottom horizontal end of the door panel.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As is clearly shown in the Keating patent, in Figure 2, the truss is mounted on an inside face of the door panel. The door panel is in longitudinal sections. As the Examiner will note hinges connect the door panels so when the door is raised, the hinges permit the door panels to travel to an overhead position. In order to do this, the hinges must be on an inside face of the door. The bar 25, which the Examiner refers to as the truss, is clearly mounted on an inside face of the door.

Since Andersen fails to disclose a truss externally mounted on an outside face of the door (as the Examiner recognizes), and clearly Keating shows the bar mounted on an inside face of the door, rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be maintained.

The same holds true for the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 50, 51, 55, 56, 58 and 59. All of these claims contain the element that the truss is attached to an outside face of the door.

Likewise, the Examiner's rejection of claims 36, 38-41, 43-45, 48 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen in view of Mursinna and Keating also cannot be maintained for the same reason mentioned above. None of the references alone or in combination teach or suggest a truss attached to an outside face of the door.

The Examiner also rejected claims 37, 42, 46 and 47 under the basic combination of Andersen, Mursinna and Keating along with other references. Again, since these claims also

include the element of a truss attached to an outside face of the door, and neither Mursinna nor Andersen show a truss, and Keating shows a truss on an inside face to the door, it is believed that the rejection under 35 § 103(a) cannot be maintained.


The Examiner also commented that applicant's amended phraseology "for maintenance of structural integrity when the door member is in the open position" fails to limit the claimed invention since the limitation fails to be positively recited.

Independent claims 36, 49 and 57 have been amended as follows "wherein structural integrity of the door is maintained when the door member is in the open position" and thusly, this element is positively now recited in the claims. It is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 
Z. Peter Sawicki, Reg. No. 30,214
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

ZPS:cnn